REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 15-23 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 9, 12, 15, 18, and 19 are amended and claims 8, 11, 13, 14, 24, and 25 are cancelled. Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 8. Claim 9 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 11. Claim 12 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 13 and 14. Claims 15 and 18 are amended to correct the dependency of these claims. Claim 19 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 24 and 25. No new matter is introduced. By these amendments, Applicants do not surrender any range of equivalents. Prompt allowance of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 is objected to because its dependency is incorrect. Claim 15 is amended to correct its dependency. Therefore, this objection is rendered moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, and 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,311,327 to O'Brien et al (O'Brien). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference," Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); see also MPEP § 2131. "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. In re Bond, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). O'Brien does not expressly or inherently describe each and every element of independent claims 1, 9, 12 and 19. Therefore, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12 and 15-23 are allowable.

For example, O'Brien does not disclose the system of claim 1,

> wherein the trace filter is adapted to implement a filter table for storing the filtering criteria, the filter table having a list of tag types and associated collection flags indicating that the respective tag type is collectable when set.

Figure 3, and the related discussion, of the present application illustrate an embodiment of the trace filter implementing a filter table. The software analysis system taught by O'Brien does not implement a filter table. See, Figure 5, and the related discussion, of O'Brien which illustrates

the absence of a filter table from O'Brien's software analysis system. Neither of the sections of O'Brien cited by the Examiner in Paper No. 6 (*i.e.*, col. 23, lines 3-10 and col. 8, lines 32-59) include any description, express or otherwise, of a filter table having a list of tag types and associated collection flags. Col. 23, lines 3-10 of O'Brien describe "a programming language-dependent parser" and a "programming language-independent instrumenter" that do not have filtering functions, let alone implement a filter table. Col. 8, lines 32-59 of O'Brien describes the probe tip 12 and software analysis functions of the probe chassis 20, but does not describe any filtering functions, let alone a filter table. Since O'Brien does not expressly or inherently describe a filter table, claim 1 is not anticipated by O'Brien. Consequently, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-8 are allowable.

Claim 9 recites a "filter table having a collection flag associated with each tag type, the collection flag indicative of whether the respective tag type is collectable." Therefore, for at least the same reasons described above for claim 1, claim 9 is also not anticipated by O'Brien. Consequently, claim 9 and its dependent claim 10 are allowable.

Further, O'Brien does not disclose the system of claim 12,

> wherein the programmable means comprises a filter tag collected by the collecting means, the filter tag having tag data reprogramming the filtering criteria in accordance with the tag data of the filter tag.

Filter tags are one of the variety of type of tags taught by the present application. Nowhere does O'Brien describe, expressly or inherently, filter tags. Nowhere does O'Brien describe, expressly or inherently, filter tags having tag data reprogramming the filtering criteria according to which tag filtering means filters the emitted tags. Neither the cited col. 23, lines 3-10 nor the col. 8, lines 32-59 of O'Brien mention any tags even similar to filter tags. Therefore, claim 12 is not anticipated by O'Brien. Consequently, claim 12 and its dependent claims 15-18 are allowable.

Claim 19 recites "collecting a filter tag and setting a collection flag for the tag types in accordance with the tag data of the filter tag." Therefore, for at least the same reasons described above for claim 12, claim 19 is also not anticipated by O'Brien. Consequently, claim 19 and its dependent claims 20-23 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **October 28, 2003**

Sean S. Wooden
Registration No. 43,997
Andrews Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-2738
Fax (202) 662-2739